DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 460 673 IR 017 608

TITLE	Educational Technology Institute Report, 1995.
INSTITUTION	New Mexico State Dept. of Education, Santa Fe.
PUB DATE	1995-00-00
NOTE	21p.; Institutes co-sponsored by The New Mexico Council for Technology in Education, The Panasonic Foundation, The Technology Manufacturers, and the Host High Education Institutes. Kurt Steinhaus, Director of Educational Technology Programs; Kathy Anderson, Project Coordinator. Attachments listed at the end of the report are not included.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Distance Education; *Educational Technology; *Instructional Development; Long Range Planning; Participant Satisfaction; Shared Resources and Services; *State Aid; State Departments of Education; State Legislation; State Programs; *Statewide Planning; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	*New Mexico

ABSTRACT

An Educational Technology Institute (ETI) has been offered annually by the New Mexico State Department of Education cooperatively and collaboratively with numerous other groups since its inception in 1990. The 1995 ETI was developed to address implementation of New Mexico's 1994 Technology for Education Act. This act provides for funding utilization and integration of technology within the K-12 public school instructional program and created a council which both advises the state department and legislature regarding appropriate educational technology standards for the public schools and assists districts in developing long-range technology plans. The goals of ETI 1995 were to: (1) assist in developing district 3-5 year plans for integrating technology into the learning process; (2) discuss resource sharing for distance learning networking, and professional development; (3) to provide a forum to participate in statewide planning to support the New Mexico Education 2000 panel; and (4) help districts develop strategies for including technology in one plan concept called "Education Plan for Student Success." This report chronicles the planning of the four regional institutes, including scheduling securing agency sponsorships and host institutions, registering, finalizing administrative details, and creating mechanisms for feedback on the content and presentation of the institutes. The content of the institutes themselves is also described with lists of: (1) attendance figures; (2) featured activities, including assessing the current state of technology integration, assessing future plans, working on the district long-range technology plan, and seeing vendor displays; (3) keynote speakers; and (4) workshop presentations. Results of the participants' written evaluations are included, along with analysis of some of the strengths and weaknesses of the institutes' topics, formats, and logistics. Finally, the report offers some recommendations for the planning and coverage of future institutes. (BEW)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 460 673

1995 EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY INSTITUTE REPORT

Institutes Co-Sponsored By:
The New Mexico Council For Technology In Education
The Panasonic Foundation
Technology Manufacturers
Host High Education Institutions

Kurt Steinhaus, Director Educational Technology Programs
State Department Of Education
Kathy Andreson, Ph.D., Project Coordinator

IR017665

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
K. Andresen
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1995 EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY INSTITUTES

Purposes:

- Further develop school district 3-5 year plans for integrating appropriate technology into the learning process.

- Discuss sharing resources for distance learning, networking, and professional development.

- Participate in statewide planning to support the New Mexico Education 2000 Panel.

- Develop strategies for including technology in the district Educational Plan for Student Success -- one plan concept.

EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY INSTITUTE 1995 REPORT

"After six months of implementing the Technology For Education Act 1994, it is clear that school district technology teams and task forces need to meet. They need to meet to develop agreements for sharing resources and to discuss successes, problems and strategies for integrating technology into the learning process."

Alan D. Morgan, State Superintendent of Public Instruction
December 21, 1994 memorandum to school district superintendents

Background

An Educational Technology Institute (ETI) has been offered by the State Department of Education (SDE) cooperatively and collaboratively with numerous other groups since ETI's inception in 1990. Kurt Steinhaus developed the institute concept and has coordinated each of the previous institutes contracting project coordinators for their assistance in scheduling and delivery for the past five. The focus of each institute has varied according to the anticipated participant's identified needs. In previous institutes, linking with higher education personnel and programs, work with business associates, sessions for public school administrators as well as training for K-12 educators have been targets for ETI learning opportunity development. Organization and focus for ETI has included themes or strands of training for identified groups, specifically identified "hands-on" sessions, introductions to long-term technology projects, and identification and examination of technology resources and providers.

The 1995 ETI was developed to address implementation of the State of New Mexico's 1994 Technology For Education Act providing for funding utilization and integration of technology within the K-12 public school instructional program. This act also created a council to advise the state department and legislature regarding appropriate educational technology standards for the public schools and to assist districts in development of their long-range technology plans. To address implementation of this act, the goals determined for ETI 1995 were to: 1) provide assistance in development of district 3-5 year plans for integrating technology into the learning process, 2) provide an opportunity for discussing resource sharing for distance learning, networking, and professional development, 3) provide a forum to participate in statewide planning to support the New Mexico Education 2000 panel, and 4) help districts develop strategies for including technology in the district "Educational Plan for Student Success"-- one plan concept.

Project Director - Kurt Steinhaus, Director Educational Technology Programs
New Mexico State Department of Education
Project Coordinator - Kathleen M. Andreson, Ph.D.

ETI 1995 Development

In December of 1994, Kurt Steinhaus, SDE Director Educational Technology Programs contracted Kathleen M Andreson, Ph.D., a private training consultant, as the project coordinator to work with him to arrange and conduct four regional technology institutes. Co-sponsors of the institutes were the newly appointed Council for Technology in Education (CTE), the Panasonic Foundation, technology manufactures, and higher education institutions willing to host the events. Assistance for technology planning was to be the major focus for ETI 1995 with sites selected so that technology task force members representing the state's 89 K-12 public school districts might be able to attend. With a June 1st deadline for submission of district technology plans to the CTE/SDE for review, it was determined that all four institutes needed to occur as soon as possible.

Regional community colleges or universities were contacted for scheduling of the events. Selection of these sites was based upon several determinations. It was anticipating that space at no cost to the project would be available to SDE, that appropriate space for the anticipated activities would be more readily available in those settings rather than in a local school system where class loads and scheduling of activities tends to be more complex, to showcase growing technology training that is occurring in the state's institutions of higher education, and finally to promote discussions concerning technology resource utilization in a regional location. Sites and dates selected were:

- Farmington - San Juan Community College - March 2-4
- Silver City - Western New Mexico University - March 16-18
- Clovis - Clovis Community College - March 24-26
- Las Vegas - Luna Vocational Technical Institute - March 31-April 2

Attempting to provide these regional conferences prior to April 1st, and knowing that all public school institutions set their calendars a year ahead, it was impossible to avoid spring break at all locations. Spring breaks would be in progress for some districts in two of the locations identified. It further became necessary to schedule two of the institutes on Fridays through Sundays rather than the preferred Thursday through Saturday format squeezing our schedule within those already set in our host institutions of higher education. The first institutes also overlapped the concluding weeks of the 1995 New Mexico Legislative session in Santa Fe. As we began, it was uncertain what response would result given these conflicts, if attending

participants would stay throughout the three days scheduled in their location on either the Saturdays or the Sundays, or if vendors would travel to these locations.

Each site selected needed to provide arrangements for approximately 22 district technology task force teams of up to 125 participants coming from that region of the state. All sites had to contain at least one space where all participants could gather to receive information and smaller rooms for team working sessions. As sites were selected, a site contact person and local school district host was identified (see attachments pp. 1-4). Site contact persons from the selected institution and the district were:

- Farmington - Ellen Stauffer & Tom Sullivan
- Silver City - Barbara James & Carol Davis
- Clovis - Alice Wylie & Michael Lamb
- Las Vegas - Leroy Ulibarri & William Maes / Orlando Espinosa

Registration

A January 1995 letter of invitation from the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Alan Morgan, an announcement flyer and registration form (see attachments pp. 5-7) were developed by Kurt and mailed to superintendents in the 89 school districts. Letters inviting participation by CTE members, announcements for interested "others" from public instruction, and corporate sponsorship letters were also developed and distributed (see attachments pp. 8-13). Follow-up mailings and telephone contacts continued with both Kurt's and Kathy's offices from the January announcements through the final March event.

The institute three day format and supporting agenda activities were designed to support the identified purposes for ETI 1995 (see attachments p. 14). Local districts were asked to assume the costs of substitute teachers as needed, travel arrangements and costs, overnight accommodations, and some meals. Although adjustments in timing, group movement and material provided were to be modified for each site, a confirmation of their registration, the basic three day agenda, and anticipated arrangements were provided to district teams as they registered for their selected site (see attachments. pp. 15-18).

Letters inviting participation from vendors were sent to more than 360 technology hardware, software and networking providers. Their interest in sponsoring the long-range planning processes during ETI 1995 was solicited in the form of a fee for displaying their products on two of the three days of

the institutes, demonstrating or giving mini-workshop sessions during day three of the agenda, for supporting payment for participant meals, and for providing support for securing speakers (see attachments pp. 19-23). Vendor fees were also needed to support some of the materials preparation and purchase of supplies needed for the three days of team planning. Of those vendors contacted, 28 provided their assistance (see attachments p. 24).

The institute co-sponsors were contacted for their assistance as well. From the CTE keynote speakers for two sites were arranged, one a council member, the other a group of staff persons from a member's district. Council members also welcomed participants and answered questions for participants at sites where they were attending. All actively took part in ETI activities. The Panasonic Foundation was an integral partner in helping support not only the entire ETI 1995 focus, but for the additional assistance supporting of one keynote speaker for all four sites. Traveling from Colorado each week to the four sites, Superintendent of the Boulder Valley Public Schools, Dr. Dean Damon provided information about technology planning from his district level perspective. His presentation and discussions with participants helped teams identify key elements for their thinking and plan development. The International Business Machines Corporation (IBM) was also an integral partner in helping support not only the entire ETI 1995 focus, but for additional assistance in supporting purchase of meals for participants and providing a specific session on their technology planning processes.

Details

To support the work of the district teams, a variety of support activities were accomplished.

- A resource notebook of planning suggestions, related articles, and specific on-line resources was compiled by Kurt and his office and given to each participating district team.
- As the project developed, Kurt wrote for and received a state partnership grant with the Microsoft corporation for the distribution of software, one set for each district team (see attachments p.25). Attending districts were to sign a licensing agreement for the use of the software and then arrange for further training in its use within their systems. District compiled evaluations of the software use and training will be sent for analysis to Kurt's office in the fall. Software platforms were distributed on day two of each conference.

- All participants also received a packet of materials supporting the institute focus. Some of the materials were gathered by local hosts and related to the specific location where the institute was arranged, some were generic materials for conference attendance (pencil, pads), and other items included were brochures, catalogs and announcements from vendors participating in the project. At each site, the packets of materials were assembled prior to the start of the three day event.
- Sign-in lists and an agenda for each location were developed as arrangements became finalized. Each agenda contained information about the specific site contact people, keynote speakers, workshop sessions and participating vendors (see attachments pp. 26-31).
- Hosting districts were asked to reproduce the agenda for participants if possible, provide name tags for participants if available, help with materials packet preparation and registration, and provide some poster board for announcing sessions and directions.
- Supporting the ETI expected outcomes, information, interactive processes, worksheets and handouts were then designed related to each presentation segment (see attachments pp. 34-44).
- Collaboration with the SDE School Program and Professional Development Unit at site 3 - Clovis - occurred in scheduling their yearly training in leadership and teacher performance evaluation processes (see attachments pp. 32-33). The Clovis site was able to provide additional rooms and services to cover the two events. Attendees from districts participating in the ETI or Leadership strands were able to join each other for meals, for keynote speakers and for viewing of the vendor displays.
- An E-Mail distribution list was created so all involved in institute preparations could share ideas and up-dates.
- In January and February, the four selected sites were visited, rooms identified, and schedules developed between the project coordinator and local contact persons.
- The daily coffee breaks, afternoon snacks, one luncheon, and a late afternoon reception were served by the food services department at each of the hosting institutions. Times, menus, and pricing were arranged by the project coordinator at all sites. This lowered the catering costs, showcased the selected host community college, and limited the contact to one person rather than numerous supporting vendors. This was made possible by pooling vendor fees and then redistributing fees to cover billings across all four sites.

Feedback

Many methods were used to collect feedback concerning each of the four institute schedules, activities and information content, presenters and organizers, and other general areas for review.

- Photos of participants engaging in their planning were taken at each of the institutes. As these pictures were taken, participants were asked to reflect on their experiences.
- Daily contact was maintained with the site and district contact persons to ensure all was proceeding as planned. In all discussions, local hosts were asked for their perceptions about how things were progressing and how they judged the tenor of the participants. These local contact persons were familiar with many of the attendees and could give observations from their experiences with the region educators.
- All presenters were invited to give their comments and express their feelings to Kurt or Kathy after completion of their sessions as well.
- A written feedback evaluation sheet was developed for all participants to complete and return to the institute staff soliciting their critical comments and suggestions (see attachments p. 39).
- Participants were additionally invited to give feedback to their local superintendent and to the state superintendent.
- As each institute concluded, letters of thanks were prepared for all those involved in the coordination and delivery of the event. Presidents of each community college or university and each local district superintendent received letters mentioning the work of their personnel in helping host the events (see attachments p. 38). Copies of the letters of appreciation were also distributed to Alan Morgan, State Superintendent and Albert Zamora, Associate Superintendent for Learning Services. Participating vendors received a letter of appreciation for their support and all were invited to send in their reactions to the events.

ETI 1995 Results

Total number of participants and districts represented

LOCATION	PARTICIPANTS	DISTRICTS
Farmington	77	15
Silver City	33	15
Clovis	61	20
Las Vegas	98	28
TOTAL	**269**	**78**

The total represents **88%** participation from the state's school district teams. Task Force teams numbered from 1 - 16 members. The numbers indicated at the Clovis site reflect only those registered for ETI and not those attending the Leadership strand as well.

Program content included:

☆ 1/2 day assessing the current status of technology integration
"Where are we now? (see attachments p. 34)

☆ 1/2 day assessing future technology utilization plans
"Tools for Planning: Where do we need to go an how do we get there?"
(see attachments p. 35)

☆ 1/2 day working on the district long-range technology plan
(see attachments p. 36)

☆ 1/2 day to attend vendor displays, tours, and technology related workshop sessions (see attachments p. 37)

☆ Evaluation and certificates for all participants (see attachments pp. 39-40)

Keynote Speakers and site presentations included:

- **Dr. Dean Damon**, Superintendent Boulder Valley Public Schools
"Effective Planning: The On Ramp To The Information Super Highway"
(site 1, 2, 3, 4) (see attachments pp. 40-44)

- **Cuba** Independent School's staff members
"The Electronic Classroom" (site 1)

- **Nolan Gray**, New Mexico State University and CTE member
"The Role of Technology In School Reform" (site 2)

- **Roland DeRose**, professional speaker
"If you do what you've always done, you'll get what you've always got!" (site 3)

- **Marjorie Haynie**, Principal Cimirron Public Schools
"One School's Attempt at Systemic Change." (site 4)

Workshop presentations

A call for practitioner-presenters was extended to members of an electronic discussion , Technology Advocacy Group (TAG). Their members were then encouraged to pass the invitation on to others. Hard copy requests for presentations were sent to appropriate university departments and to the hosting school district in each location (see attachments p. 45). One practitioner was identified and scheduled for each site. Practitioner-presenters and sites included:

- Four **Cuba** Public School's staff members (site 1)
- **Dr. Karin Wiburg** NMSU & 3 graduate students (site 2)
- **Michael Lamb**, Clovis Public Schools (site 3)
- **Eleanor Isham**, Clovis Community College (site 3)
- **Betsy Fredrick**, Albuquerque Public Schools (site 4)

Vendors were also invited to identify sessions they felt would support the planning process for the districts. The following vendors offered workshop sessions for participants:

- **IBM** (sites 1,2,3,4)
- **IDEANET** (sites 1,2,3,4)
- **Apple Computer** (site 2)

Corporate sponsorship was contributed by Sunwest Bank, Lovelace Health Systems, and US West. Lovelace provided money and participant packet items for the Farmington location, Sunwest provided bags for our

organization of materials as well as pads and pencils for all locations. Finally, US West presented planning information in two separate workshop sessions at all four institutes.

Participant written evaluation results

At the beginning of day three at each of the four locations, participants were given an evaluation form to complete (see attachments p. 46). Forms were then left anonymously at the registration table though out the morning. A total of **81** evaluations representing **30 %** of the total participants were returned and the five questions compiled for analysis.

① **Overall rating** of the conference on a 1 - 5 scale (5 being highest):

5 - 47%
4 - 41%
3 - 6%
2 - 0%
1 - 0%
- 6% "other" ratings

② When asked for the **top three aspects of ETI**, although all aspects of each institute were mentioned, the following items were most often mentioned across all four sites:

- Sharing/talking/discussions with other districts
- Time for district teams to work on their technology long-range plans
- Information/ideas/knowledge gained
- Speakers/presenters/sessions
- Networking and meeting other educators

③ Many participants offered a great variety of possibilities for a future ETI when asked **how ETI might serve you**. The following thoughts were most frequently mentioned across the four sites:

- Funding / grant information
- SDE keeping in touch to let them know about new technologies, plans, etc.
- "Hands-on" sessions
- More vendors
- Further planning assistance

④ When asked **should ETI alternate** between a central location one year and to a regional location the next, participants responded that they:

- Strongly agreed 23%
- Agreed 32%
- Disagreed 26%
- Strongly disagreed 12%
- Not marked 6%

Frequently mentioned as reasons for agreeing or disagreeing were:

- Central locations draw more vendors
- Regional locations make it easier to attend

⑤ Finally, participants were asked for **other comments** concerning ETI 1995. From **77%** of the evaluations submitted other comments and suggestions were offered. Of those comments, many were ideas for future ETI's, many were praise for this year's ETI"s and a few contained remarks critical of the program. Examples of each type are as follows:

- How about a newsletter, address book, or up-dates to all ETI participants.
- Thanks for all the hard work
- Don't schedule training over spring break

ANALYSIS OF ETI 1995

The following points are from the project coordinator's perspective. Information about the results of ETI 1995 can also be obtained from the perspective of the project director, the keynote speakers, the presenters, CTE members, vendors, local contact persons and from a review of the technology plans submitted on June 1st.

ETI 1995 was highly successful in meeting the four identified outcomes at all four regional locations. This conclusion is based upon:

- Review of the written evaluations,
- Weekly discussions between the project director and the project coordinator,
- Daily reflections among the director, coordinator, keynote speakers, hosts and presenters at each site,
- Participation in the task force activities with district teams,
- Observation of the teams in planning activities,
- Listening to the responses surrounding all sessions, and
- One-on-one discussions with numerous participants.

At all locations, many participants made it a point to report their approval of the activities and information they were receiving. Many comments were directly related to the positive feelings resulting from holding ETI within their region of the state. Some vendors also expressed their appreciation for the opportunity to show their products in regional locations, several for the first time.

Validation of their activities and technology advances was important to participants. The institute agenda provided them the opportunity to talk about their achievements, plans and dreams. Sharing those struggles with surrounding districts was a highlight for a majority of those attending.

Providing assistance and information concerning their long-range technology planning was the strongest feature of the agenda. Kurt's presence, presentations, participation and responsiveness at all the sites reinforced the offer of assistance and support from the state department to the districts.

- Observations of the teams as they worked and the resulting products they prepared, displayed and discussed indicated these sites and the agenda were conducive to the advancement of long-range planning processes. These sessions also provided evidence of opening discussions among regional districts around possibilities of sharing technology resources.

- Selection of one keynote speaker, Dean Damon, to be present at all sites provided a strong link to the planning information and activities delivered at each site by Kathy and Kurt. All three of these sessions were highly successful in engaging the participants in thinking about their technology plans.

- Districts and even regions are on a continuum of readiness for the use of technology within their instructional programs. Some have not started the thinking nor discussions behind technology utilization, while there are those in advanced integration and preparation stages utilizing a variety of technologies. ETI 1995 tried to provide information useful to all districts within this vast continuum. Given this vast disparity, district planning needs are many and varied making future ETI content development even more critical. Some participants were at their first technology conference and were overwhelmed with new vocabulary and information. It seems sessions for the novice are still needed.

- While still evaluated as a positive experience, districts represented by a single task force member were not as actively engaged in planning nor could they take advantage of all the sessions available. Districts with entire teams attending seemed to move rapidly ahead in their processes.

- Participants indicated (64% of the written evaluations) they preferred to hold regional ETI's every-other year, yet their comments were overwhelmingly positive about this year's selection of a regional sites. At all sites there were many request to do it there again.

- Most districts chose to attend within their geographical area, while a few selected attendance at institutes held outside what might be considered their regional location. Participants reported this was due to weather, personal choice, or the spring break conflict. Having alternative locations was a plus for some ETI participants. A surprising number of districts required multiple mailings and numerous phone calls to finalize their participation.

- Holding the events at the community colleges and WNMU resulted in increased awareness of program offerings at those sites. Some participants had not visited these institutions and they expressed their interest while touring their facilities.

- While the distribution of the Microsoft software was a definite positive addition to the institute agenda, some districts attended for that reason only. Those districts or participants were not deeply involved in the other agenda activities and in fact, some participants left the institute after receiving their software.

- Scheduling ETI during spring breaks and even on the Saturday and Sundays selected did limit participation. Understandably, some educators are unwilling to attend any training that requires their time on weekends and breaks. The attendees where these situations did occur were definitely those committed to the goals of ETI. On the other hand, some participants expressed their gratitude for doing ETI over spring break so they didn't have to leave their classrooms.

- At least one CTE member was present at each of the ETI sites. Their visible participation, assistance and discussions with districts could advance their work. The help from Joe Lopez - Cuba, Earl Phillip and Nolan Gray - Las Cruces, and Pam Tipton - Roswell, was especially appreciated.

- Of all the interactions among the staff, presenters and participants, and reviewing all the written evaluations received, only ONE participant was entirely negative. This is quite remarkable from 269 educators!

Recommendations

- Planning for ETI 1996 should begin immediately. The short "turn around time" from the project beginning to the scheduled events made certain aspects difficult if not impossible to arrange. For example, continuing education credit for participants could not be arranged. The deadline for proposals for the spring semester credit courses had already passed for university or community college courses as ETI planning began.

- Focus and tentative agendas should be developed prior to contacting the districts. Due to the development of the content as well as registration at the same time, two mailings, and many phone calls (and with several districts many more) were required to notify district task force members of what was scheduled and how they would benefit from attending. Mailings for ETI 1996 might also be sent to 1995 participants as well as district superintendents to spread the information more readily.

- An earlier start on the project could help identify appropriate sites and locations and hopefully avoid the conflict of scheduling during the legislative session, over spring breaks or expecting participants to attend on a Sunday and even Saturday.

- Participants submitting written evaluations gave many ideas for future ETI content and organization. Prior to ETI 1996 planning, those suggestions should be carefully reviewed.

- ETI could have a "standing committee" of volunteers representing various districts, educational levels, institutions, and positions. This group would help Kurt with the yearly coordination across the state. The committee chair could monitor the ETI "budget" and provide substitute coverage for members to attend meetings and to accomplish their work. A portion of the budget could provide for an "executive assistant" to complete the many secretarial/clerical tasks as well as maintain a constant link with all members.

- Identifying a local host in the school districts produced minimal assistance at two of the sites, less than minimal at the other two. The community college contact person became a more important link for overseeing the event. At two sites even that link did little to help with coordination. If ETI

is to be held at sites remote from the project director and coordinator, a local contact that can be depended upon is essential to smooth operation. Local school district personnel are very busy people. Perhaps their "volunteer" assistance, or even minimal pay assistance is unrealistic.

- Charging a small ($10.00-$20.00) registration fee for school personnel might encourage stronger commitment to participation. Approximately 400 people were pre-registered for this year's ETI and of those 269 actually attended or 68% of those expected. This difference in number between anticipated and actual participants makes arranging for space, food and materials difficult.

- To meet the variety of needs due to the differing levels of technology use in the state's districts, the content and delivery should be developed based upon a thorough needs assessment. Perhaps CTE can provide information about the various "states" within our state.

- Discussion of computers alone is not the entire answer to integrating technology within our instructional programs. Strands of information such as NETWORKING (i.e., LANS, WANS, On-line, and video-conferencing), MULTIMEDIA (i.e., CD Roms, graphics, animation, hypertext), and MOBILITY (i.e., distance Ed, time and space elements) could help organize ETI content. Participants/teams would then select areas according to the needs and level of development within their district.

- A "virtual conference" format should be explored for participants not wanting to travel but having the capability of interacting through on-line and video conferencing techniques. This companion strand could be offered in addition to live participation. Modeling the utilization of the latest methods for technology integration within the instruction delivered is essential.

- The role of vendors should be examined. Their participation fees make it possible to provide participants with food and materials, but that also means they become an integral part of the agenda. Having vendors identify presenters relinquishes ETI focus to their perspective. ETI 1995 asked that vendors allow the project coordinator to identify and schedule presenters as well as arrange for food services. Most vendors agreed that was acceptable and even preferable rather than each of them calling for arrangements.

- Support for presentations from the state's top educators utilizing technology should be solicited early in the planning process. This would include budgeting for their travel and accommodations as well as an honorarium for their expertise. As these educators are identified, their names, addresses and areas of work could be compiled for a resource directory - or professional development assistance network - electronically available of course.

- Technology alone is not the answer to the need for increased educational effectiveness. New models of innovation and teacher training could also be explored through ETI. Professional development for teachers is a critical core for any future ETI planning (see attachments pp. 47-49).

- This year's success in planning parallel programs with another SDE unit warrants further exploration. Future ETI's could correspond with other SDE events involving multiple units.

- Increased involvement of the Council for Technology in Education would provide a stronger link to the planning occurring at the state level. Their participation while encouraged was not possible due to the full-time positions they hold in addition to CTE membership. Monthly CTE meetings and sub-task force meetings of that body make these very busy members. If ETI 1996 is identified as a means to help that body complete their work, early coordination is needed. ETI might be further explored as a sub-task for CTE.

- Regional institutes bring SDE visibility to areas of the state not frequently visited. However, travel to four sites and conducting four institutes in the period of one month is taxing on all involved. Although 64% of the written evaluations indicated participants would like ETI to alternate between a regional and a central location, consideration of available resources, registration fees, vendor participation, travel and staff availability should also be considered. Perhaps two ETI's one north - one south, or one east - one west, could provide the best of both ideas.

- If ETI 1996 is held in a central location rather than in regional locations, there remains a great need to arrange for regional discussions within the program content. If sharing of resources and discussions of technology utilization are to be supported regionally, either regional follow-ups or separate sessions by regions at a central location are called for.

- Additional SDE staff and resources are needed to adequately address the technology planning needs of the 89 New Mexico Public School districts. Kurt alone cannot possible assist in the development of each plan, and even four ETIs can only provide limited assistance in supporting that process.

- An E-mail ETI discussion group should be established across the four regions. This on-going discussion surrounding the goals of ETI 1995 might assist the CTE, and Kurt's office in promoting systemic change in our schools. Their "front-line" practitioners view is valuable in setting new directions. They could also be informed of state level information concerning technology planning as it becomes available.

ATTACHMENTS:

Site contacts	1 - 4
Flyer	5
Superintendent's letter	6
Registration	7
Council memos	8 - 11
Corporate letter	12 - 13
Sample 3 day format	14
Sample return packet	15 - 18
Vendor information	19 - 24
Microsoft memo	25
Participant lists	26 - 27
Farmington agenda	28
Silver City agenda	29
Clovis agenda	30
Las Vegas agenda	31
Clovis memos	32 - 33
Where are we now?	34
Where are we going?	35
Planning	36
Touring	37
Sample thank you letter	38
Final evaluation	39
Certificate of participation	40
Keynote handouts	41 - 44
Call for presenters	45
Evaluation results	46
Article	47 - 49